arXiv:1604.08337v3 [math.RA] 24 May 2016

Decomposition of integer-valued polynomial algebras

G. Peruginelli*
N. J. Werner†

May 25, 2016

Abstract

Let D be a commutative domain with field of fractions K, let A be a torsion-free D-algebra, and let B be the extension of A to a K-algebra. The set of integer-valued polynomials on A is $\mathrm{Int}(A) = \{f \in B[X] \mid f(A) \subseteq A\}$, and the intersection of $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ with $K[X]$ is $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$, which is a commutative subring of $K[X]$. The set $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ may or may not be a ring, but it always has the structure of a left $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$-module.

A D-algebra A which is free as a D-module and of finite rank is called Int_K-decomposable if a D-module basis for A is also an $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$-module basis for $\mathrm{Int}(A)$; in other words, if $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ can be generated by $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ and A. A classification of such algebras has been given when D is a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. In the present article, we modify the definition of Int_K-decomposable so that it can be applied to D-algebras that are not necessarily free by defining A to be Int_K-decomposable when $\mathrm{Int}(A) \cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$. We then provide multiple characterizations of such algebras in the case where D is a discrete valuation ring or a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. In particular, if D is the ring of integers of a number field K, we show that an Int_K-decomposable algebra A must be a maximal D-order in a separable K-algebra B, whose simple components have as center the same finite unramified Galois extension F of K and are unramified at each finite place of F. Finally, when both D and A are rings of integers in number fields, we prove that Int_K-decomposable algebras correspond to unramified Galois extensions of K.

Keywords: Integer-valued polynomial, algebra, Int-decomposable, Maximal order, Finite unramified Galois extension

MSC Primary 13F20 Secondary 16H10, 11C99

1 Introduction

Let D be a commutative integral domain with field of fractions K. The ring of integer-valued polynomials over D is defined to be $\mathrm{Int}(D) := \{f \in K[X] \mid f(D) \subseteq D\}$. The ring $\mathrm{Int}(D)$, its elements, and its properties have been popular objects of study over the past several decades and continue to be so today. The book [4] is the standard reference on the topic.

*Department of Mathematics, University of Padova, Via Trieste, 63 35121 Padova, Italy. E-mail: gperugin@math.unipd.it

†Department of Mathematics, Computer and Information Science, SUNY College at Old Westbury, Old Westbury, NY 11568, United States. E-mail: wernern@oldwestbury.edu

Beginning around 2010, attention turned to polynomials that act on D-algebras rather than on D itself. This can be seen in the work of Evrard, Fares and Johnson [6, 7], Frisch [8, 9, 10], Loper [13], Peruginelli [5, 17, 18, 19, 20], and Werner [27, 29, 30]. For this generalization, we let A be a torsion-free D-algebra such that $A \cap K = D$ and take $B = K \otimes_D A$ to be the extension of A to a K-algebra. We associate K and A with their canonical images in B via the maps $k \mapsto k \otimes 1$ and $a \mapsto 1 \otimes a$; this allows us to evaluate polynomials in $B[X]$ at elements of A. Since B may be a noncommutative ring, we assume that in $B[X]$ the indeterminate X commutes with all elements of B, and we adopt the convention that polynomials in $B[X]$ are evaluated with X on the right. Finally, we define

$$\mathrm{Int}(A) := \{f \in B[X] \mid f(A) \subseteq A\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int}_K(A) := \mathrm{Int}(A) \cap K[X] = \{f \in K[X] \mid f(A) \subseteq A\}.$$

Definition 1.1. When A is a torsion-free D-algebra such that $A \cap K = D$, we say that A is a D-algebra with *standard assumptions*. When A is finitely generated as a D-module, we say that A is of *finite type*.

Because of the above requirement $A \cap K = D$, it is clear that $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ is a commutative ring that lies between $D[X]$ and $\mathrm{Int}(D)$, but the algebraic structure of $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is more nebulous. It is straightforward to verify that $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is closed under addition, and in fact has the structure of a left $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$-module. However, because $B[X]$ may contain polynomials with non-commuting coefficients, there is no guarantee that $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is closed under multiplication. Indeed, for $f(X), g(X) \in B[X]$, let $(fg)(X)$ denote their product in $B[X]$. Since we insist that polynomials only be evaluated when the indeterminate is to the right of any coefficients, if $a \in A$ is not a central element, then $(fg)(a)$ may not equal $f(a)g(a)$.

There are circumstances under which $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is closed under multiplication, and thus has a ring structure under the usual operations inherited from $B[X]$. For instance, this will be true if A itself is a commutative ring. More generally, if each element of A is a sum of units and central elements, then $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring [28, Thm. 1.2]. This condition is sufficient for $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ to be a ring, but is not necessary; a counterexample may be found in [30, Ex. 3.8].

In this paper, we investigate an interesting property that $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ sometimes exhibits, and which was first noted by Sophie Frisch in [8, Thm. 7.2]. If $A = M_n(D)$ is the ring of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in D, then $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring; this follows from [28, Thm. 1.2] and the fact that $M_n(D)$ has a D-module basis consisting of invertible matrices. What Frisch observed is that $\mathrm{Int}(M_n(D))$ is itself a matrix ring. Specifically, $\mathrm{Int}(M_n(D)) \cong M_n(\mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D)))$, where the isomorphism is given by associating a polynomial with matrix coefficients to a matrix with polynomial entries.

Frisch's result led the second author to search for other algebras with a similar property [27]. To do this, the problem was recast in the following way. Assume that A, as a D-module, is free of finite rank, with D-basis $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_t$. Then, when does $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_t$ form a basis for $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ as an $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$-module? With this formulation, Frisch's theorem shows that

$$\mathrm{Int}(M_n(D)) = \bigoplus_{1 \le i,j, \le n} \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))E_{ij} \tag{1.2}$$

where the E_{ij} are the standard matrix units that form a D-basis of $M_n(D)$. An algebra $A = \bigoplus_i D\alpha_i$ such that $\mathrm{Int}(A) = \bigoplus_i \mathrm{Int}_K(A)\alpha_i$ is called *Int$_K$-decomposable* (or simply *Int-decomposable* if we wish to talk of such algebras in general). For D a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings, it was

proved [27, Thm. 6.1] that A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if for each nonzero prime P of D, there exist $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ such that $A/PA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

The work in [27] depended crucially on the presence of a D-module basis for A, and it was desirable to know if the properties of Int-decomposable algebras could be studied without assuming that A was free. This is indeed possible, and doing so is the point of the current paper. The key insight was to notice that an Int_K-decomposable algebra is one for which $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ can be generated (as a subring of $B[X]$) by A and $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$, and this property can be precisely expressed in terms of tensor products of D-algebras. We say that A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if $\mathrm{Int}(A) \cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$ (see Definition 2.2); the only limitations we impose on A are our standard assumptions that A is torsion-free and $A \cap K = D$. Note that for the case of the full matrix algebra $A = M_n(D)$ considered initially by Frisch, the matrix ring $M_n(\mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D)))$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D)) \otimes_D M_n(D)$.

If D is Dedekind with finite residue rings and A is finitely generated as a D-module, then we are able to extend the classification from [27] (Theorem 2.9). Hence, Int_K-decomposable algebras are those which are residually a direct sum of copies of a matrix ring over a finite field. Moreover, we are able to obtain two alternate characterizations of Int-decomposability, one in terms of the completions of A at primes of D (Theorem 3.6) and the other in terms of the extended K-algebra $B = A \otimes_D K$ (Theorem 4.10). Under the same assumptions on D and A, we are also able to describe when $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ (Theorem 2.10), which answers a question raised in [10].

In Section 2, we state the more general definition of Int_K-decomposable and prove several of the theorems mentioned above. Section 3 discusses the classification of Int_K-decomposable algebras in terms of completions. As our work will show, Int_K-decomposable algebras are related to matrix algebras via their residue rings and completions, but the two types of algebras are not the same. Theorem 3.11 clarifies this disparity by presenting various counterexamples. Still, we find the fact that Int-decomposable algebras are close to being matrix algebras interesting, and we close the paper by studying the consequences of Theorems 2.9 and 3.6.

An easy corollary of our classification theorems is that an Int_K-decomposable algebra A must be a maximal D-order in the K-algebra B, and B must be a semisimple K-algebra. Along these lines, in Section 4, we establish the last part of our classification. In Theorem 4.10 we prove that if D is the ring of integers of a number field K, then A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if the following four conditions are satisfied: B is a separable K-algebra with simple components which have the same center F; F is a finite unramified Galois extension of K; the simple components of B are unramified at each finite place of F; and A is a maximal D-order in B.

From this general theorem, we obtain two satisfying corollaries. First, if A is the ring of integers of a finite extension L of K, then A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if L is an unramified Galois extension of K (Corollary 4.11). Second, if $D = \mathbb{Z}$, then A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable if and only if for some n, A is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of copies of $M_n(\mathbb{Z})$ (Corollary 4.12). This last result implies that if $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A) = \mathrm{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$, then A is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of copies of $\mathbb{Z}$.

2 Int-decomposable Algebras

We begin by recalling the definition of Int_K-decomposability in the case of free D-algebras which was given in [27].

Definition 2.1. ([27, Def. 1.2]) Let A be a D-algebra that, as a D-module, is free of finite rank, so that $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} D\alpha_i$ for some D-module basis $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_t\}$. We say that A is *Int_K-decomposable*

if $\mathrm{Int}(A) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \mathrm{Int}_K(A)\alpha_i$ as an $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$-module.

It is shown in [27, Prop. 1.4] that the Int_K-indecomposability of A does not depend on the D-module basis $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_t\}$, so we may discuss such algebras without reference to a particular basis. A useful way to interpret this definition is the following. Assume $A = \bigoplus_i D\alpha_i$, let $f \in \mathrm{Int}(A)$, and decompose f as $f = \sum_i f_i\alpha_i$, where each $f_i \in K[X]$. If A is Int_K-decomposable, then we may conclude that each $f_i \in \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$. Hence, an Int_K-decomposable algebra is one for which the study of $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ reduces to the study of A and $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$.

The most prominent example of an Int_K-decomposable algebra was given by Frisch in [8, Thm. 7.2], where it is shown that when $A = M_n(D)$, the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in D, the ring $M_n(\mathrm{Int}_K(A))$ is isomorphic (as a D-algebra) to $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ as in (1.2). In contrast, many other D-algebras will not be Int_K-decomposable. For example, let $D = \mathbb{Z}$ and $A = \mathbb{Z}[i]$, the Gaussian integers. Then, $\frac{(1+i)(X^2-X)}{2} \in \mathrm{Int}(A)$, but $\frac{(X^2-X)}{2} \notin \mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A)$; hence $A = \mathbb{Z}[i]$ is not $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable. As we shall see, the fact that 2 is ramified in A is relevant here; see Corollary 4.11 for the complete classification of Int_K-decomposable algebras in the context of rings of integers in number fields.

The major theorems of [27] show that Int_K-decomposability is a local property when A is finitely generated as a D-module, and, in the case where D is a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings, give a complete classification of Int_K-decomposable algebras [27, Thm. 6.1]. Essentially, Int_K-decomposable algebras are those algebras A where each residue ring A/PA, P a maximal ideal of D, is isomorphic to a direct sum of copies of the same matrix ring (throughout the paper, unless stated otherwise, all isomorphisms are ring isomorphisms). The proof of this characterization depended crucially on the presence of a D-basis for A. Our first goal is to generalize the definition of Int_K-decomposable so that it applies to algebras that are not necessarily free.

Definition 2.2. Let D be an integral domain and A a torsion-free D-algebra. Consider the following D-bilinear map:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \times A &\to \mathrm{Int}(A) \\ (f(X), a) &\mapsto f(X) \cdot a \end{aligned}$$

By the universal property of the tensor product, there exists a unique D-module homomorphism

$$\Phi : \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A \to \mathrm{Int}(A) \tag{2.3}$$

which maps every elementary tensor product $f(X) \otimes a$ to $f(X) \cdot a$. We say that A is *Int_K-decomposable* if Φ is an isomorphism of D-modules, so that $\mathrm{Int}(A) \cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$.

Recall that the tensor product $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$ has a natural D-algebra structure with multiplication given by $(f_1(X) \otimes a_1)(f_2(X) \otimes a_2) = (f_1(X)f_2(X)) \otimes (a_1a_2)$ (see [2, Chapt. III, §4, n. 1]) , for all $f_i \in \mathrm{Int}_K(A), a_i \in A$, $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, since the elements of K are central in B, the map Φ above induces a D-algebra structure on $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ (and so, Φ becomes a D-algebra homomorphism). Therefore, when A is Int_K-decomposable, Φ is an isomorphism of D-algebras.

This definition has a number of immediate consequences, among them that Definition 2.2 reduces to the original Definition 2.1 when A is free.

Proposition 2.4.

(1) If A is Int_K-decomposable, then $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring.

(2) The following are equivalent:

(i) A *is* Int_K*-decomposable.*

(ii) the D*-module* $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ *satisfies the universal property of the tensor product of* $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ *and* A*.*

(iii) $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ *is equal to the subring of* $B[X]$ *generated by* $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ *and* A*.*

(3) Assume $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} D\alpha_i$ *is free of finite rank as a* D*-module. Then,* A *is* Int_K*-decomposable in the sense of Definition 2.1 if and only if* A *is* Int_K*-decomposable in the sense of Definition 2.2.*

Proof. (1) This is a generalization of [27, Prop. 2.2]. When A is Int_K-decomposable, it is actually isomorphic as a ring to the D-algebra $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$.

(2) The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is clear. For (iii), note that for any A (Int_K-decomposable or not), the module $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ contains all products of the form $f(X) \cdot a$, where $f \in \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ and $a \in A$. Since $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is closed under addition, it also contains the subring of $B[X]$ generated by $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ and A. Given the definition of Φ, A being Int_K-decomposable is equivalent to $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ equaling this subring.

(3) Since $A = \bigoplus_i D\alpha_i$, we have the chain of equalities

$$\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A = \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D (\bigoplus_i D\alpha_i) = \bigoplus_i (\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D D\alpha_i) = \bigoplus_i \mathrm{Int}_K(A)\alpha_i$$

from which the equivalence of the definitions is clear. □

Remark 2.5.

- While A being Int_K-decomposable implies that $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring, the converse is not true. There are numerous examples of D-algebras A which are not Int_K-decomposable but still $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring. For instance, when G is a finite group and A is the group algebra DG, $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring by [28, Thm. 1.2]. However, whenever the characteristic of D/P divides $|G|$, the group ring $A/PA \cong (D/P)G$ is not semisimple [23, Cor. 3.4.8], and hence cannot satisfy [27, Thm. 6.1]. Thus, the group algebra DG will not be Int_K-decomposable in such cases.

  Also, if p is an odd prime of $\mathbb{Z}$, $D = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, and A is a free D-algebra of finite rank, then for each $k > 0$ the residue ring A/p^kA has odd order. It then follows from [30, Thms. 2.4, 3.7] that $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ is a ring; but certainly A can be chosen so that A is not $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable.

- According to Proposition 2.4, Frisch's result (1.2) can be restated as follows:

$$\mathrm{Int}(M_n(D)) = \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D)) \otimes_D M_n(D).$$

When D is a Dedekind domain, we can prove that the map Φ in Definition 2.2 is always injective.

Lemma 2.6. *Let* D *be a Dedekind domain and* A *a* D*-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then,* $\Phi : \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A \to \mathrm{Int}(A)$ *is injective.*

Proof. Define $\Psi : K[X] \otimes_D A \to B[X]$ by $\Psi(f(X) \otimes_D a) = f(X)a$. Then, Ψ is an isomorphism of K-algebras. Since D is Dedekind and A is torsion-free, it follows that A is a projective D-module, hence flat. Therefore, the containment $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \subseteq K[X]$ implies that $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A \subseteq K[X] \otimes_D A$. Thus, the map Φ is the restriction of Ψ to $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$, and since Ψ is injective so is Φ. □

In this way, for D Dedekind, we may identify $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$ with the subring of $B[X]$ generated by $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ and A. We use this fact in proving the next proposition.

Proposition 2.7. *Let D be a Dedekind domain and A a D-algebra with standard assumptions. If $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ then A is Int_K-decomposable.*

Proof. Since D is Dedekind, $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ contains $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$ by Lemma 2.6. For the other containment, assume $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ and let $\mathrm{Int}(D, A)$ be the set $\mathrm{Int}(D, A) := \{f \in B[X] \mid f(D) \subseteq A\}$. Clearly, $\mathrm{Int}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Int}(D, A)$. By [4, Prop. IV.3.3] we have $\mathrm{Int}(D, A) = \mathrm{Int}(D) \otimes_D A$, so that

$$\mathrm{Int}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Int}(D, A) = \mathrm{Int}(D) \otimes_D A = \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A,$$

as required. □

We can also generalize [27, Thm. 3.3] and prove that Int_K-decomposability is a local property when A is finitely generated. Note that this will hold without the assumption that D is Dedekind.

Proposition 2.8. *Let D be a domain and let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if A_P is Int_K-decomposable for each prime P of D.*

Proof. By definition, A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if the map Φ in (2.3) is an isomorphism. By [1, Prop. 3.9], this holds if and only the D-modules $\mathrm{Int}(A)$ and $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A$ are isomorphic locally at each prime ideal P of D, that is, the induced maps

$$\Phi_P : (\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A) \otimes_D D_P \to \mathrm{Int}(A) \otimes_D D_P$$

are isomorphisms for each prime P of D.

Recall that for a D-module M and a multiplicative set $S \subset D$, we have $S^{-1}M \cong M \otimes_D S^{-1}D$. Thus, we always have $A_P \cong A \otimes_D D_P$ and $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)_P \cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D D_P$. Since A is finitely generated, by [27, Prop. 3.2] we have $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)_P = \mathrm{Int}_K(A_P)$ and $\mathrm{Int}(A_P) = \mathrm{Int}(A)_P$. Hence, $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D D_P \cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A_P)$ and $\mathrm{Int}(A) \otimes_D D_P \cong \mathrm{Int}(A_P)$.

Using this and other standard properties of tensor products (as in [2, Chap. II, §5]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A) \otimes_D D_P &\cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D (A \otimes_D D_P) \\ &\cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A_P \\ &\cong (\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D D_P) \otimes_{D_P} A_P \\ &\cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A_P) \otimes_{D_P} A_P.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the induced map Φ_P is an isomorphism if and only if

$$\mathrm{Int}(A_P) \cong (\mathrm{Int}_K(A) \otimes_D A) \otimes_D D_P \cong \mathrm{Int}_K(A_P) \otimes_{D_P} A_P,$$

which means that A_P is Int_K-decomposable. □

These results allow us to extend the classification of Int-decomposable algebras given in [27, Thm. 6.1].

Theorem 2.9. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then, A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if for each nonzero prime P of D, there exist $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ such that $A/PA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.*

In particular, if A is commutative, then A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if for each P there exists a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ such that $A/PA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \mathbb{F}_q$ for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Since D is Dedekind and A is finitely generated and torsion-free, A is a projective D-module [15, Cor. p. 30]. Hence, for each prime P, A_P is free as a D_P-module, and A_P has finite rank because A is finitely generated. Applying [27, Thm. 6.1] to A_P, we see that A_P is Int_K-decomposable if and only if $A_P/PA_P \cong \bigoplus_i M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ for some n and some $\mathbb{F}_q$. Using Proposition 2.8 and the fact that $A/PA \cong A_P/PA_P$, we obtain the stated theorem. □

Under the same hypotheses on D, we can describe those A for which $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$. This generalizes [27, Thm. 4.6], which dealt with the case where A was free.

Theorem 2.10. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then, $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ if and only if for each nonzero prime P of D, $A/PA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} D/P$ for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. We know that $\mathrm{Int}(D) = \bigcap_P \mathrm{Int}(D)_P$ (where the intersection is over nonzero primes P of D) and that $\mathrm{Int}(D)_P = \mathrm{Int}(D_P)$ for each P. The analogous equalities for $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ are shown in [27, Props. 3.1, 3.2]. Thus, $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ if and only if $\mathrm{Int}_K(A_P) = \mathrm{Int}(D_P)$ for each P. But, as in Theorem 2.9, each A_P is a free D_P-module of finite rank. By [27, Thm. 4.6], $\mathrm{Int}_K(A_P) = \mathrm{Int}(D_P)$ if and only if $A_P/PA_P \cong \bigoplus_i D_P/PD_P$. The result now follows because $A_P/PA_P \cong A/PA$ and $D_P/PD_P \cong D/P$. □

3 Int-decomposable Algebras via Completions

In this section, we provide an alternate characterization of Int-decomposable algebras. As in Section 2, we assume that D is a Dedekind domain with finite residue fields and that A is a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Theorem 2.9 asserts that A is Int_K-decomposable precisely when for each nonzero prime P of D, A/PA is isomorphic to a direct sum of copies of a matrix ring with entries in a finite field. Instead of focusing on A/PA, we can work with the P-adic completion $\widehat{A}_P = \varprojlim A/P^kA$ of A, which in this case is isomorphic to $A \otimes_D \widehat{D}_P$ (where $\widehat{D}_P$ is the P-adic completion of D) because A is of finite type. In Theorems 3.6 and 3.10, we prove that both Int-decomposability and the equality $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ can be characterized in terms of the completions $\widehat{A}_P$. These results complement Theorems 2.9 and 2.10, respectively.

Recall first the following definition.

Definition 3.1. For a ring R and an R-algebra A, the *null ideal* of A with respect to R, denoted $N_R(A)$, is the set of polynomials in $R[X]$ that kill A. That is, $N_R(A) = \{f \in R[X] \mid f(A) = 0\}$. When R is commutative, $N_R(A)$ is easily seen to be an ideal of $R[X]$. If $R = A$, we set $N_R(A) = N(A)$.

Null ideals are a useful tool for dealing with integer-valued polynomials because there is a correspondence between the elements of $\mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ and the null ideals $N_{D/dD}(A/dA)$, where $d \in D$. Specifically, let $f(X) = g(X)/d \in K[X]$, where $g(X) \in D[X]$ and $d \in D$. Then, $f \in \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ if and only if the residue of g in $(D/dD)[X]$ is in $N_{D/dD}(A/dA)$.

Int-decomposability can be expressed in terms of null ideals (this was the main strategy employed in [27]; see [27, Def. 4.3, Thm. 4.4]). To do this, we need a notion of "decomposability" for $N(A/P^kA)$. This is accomplished in the next definition, which is the analog of Definition 2.2.

Definition 3.2. Let P be a nonzero prime of D and let $k > 0$. We say that A/P^kA is N_{D/P^k}-*decomposable* if the canonical ring isomorphism $(D/P^k)[X] \otimes_{D/P^k} A/P^kA \cong (A/P^kA)[X]$ that maps each elementary tensor product $f(X) \otimes a$ to $f(X) \cdot a$ induces the following isomorphism of D/P^k modules:

$$N_{D/P^k}(A/P^kA) \otimes_{D/P^k} A/P^kA \cong N(A/P^kA).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then, A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if A/P^kA is N_{D/P^k}-decomposable for each nonzero prime P of D and each $k > 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.8 we may localize at a prime P and assume that D is a discrete valuation ring, and hence that A is free. Furthermore, each A/P^kA is free as a D/P^k-module, so we can always find $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_t \in A/P^kA$ such that $A/P^kA = \bigoplus_{i=1}^t D\alpha_i$. By Proposition 2.4 (3), A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if A is Int_K-decomposable in the sense of Definition 2.1; and by [27, Thm. 4.4, Def. 4.3], this is equivalent to having $N(A/P^kA) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^t N_{D/P^k}(A/P^kA)\alpha_i$ for each $k > 0$. Proceeding as in Proposition 2.4 (3), one may show this last condition is equivalent to having $N_{D/P^k}(A/P^kA) \otimes_{D/P^k} A/P^kA \cong N(A/P^kA)$. □

By Proposition 2.8, Int_K-decomposability is a local property. So, in this section we will often reduce to the local case, namely that D is a discrete valuation ring (DVR) with finite residue field $\mathbb{F}_{q_0}$ and maximal ideal $P = \pi D$. Moreover, notice that when P is a maximal ideal of D, we have $A/PA \cong A_P/PA_P$, so that

$$N_{D/P}(A/PA) = N_{D_P/PD_P}(A_P/PA_P).$$

We will use this fact freely in our subsequent work. In order to ease the notation, we set $A_k = A/P^kA$ and $D_k = D/P^k$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $D_k \subseteq A_k$ and that A_k is a torsion-free D_k-algebra, which is finitely generated as a D_k-module.

Lemma 3.4. *([27, Thm. 5.10]) Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, A_k is N_{D_k}-decomposable if and only if $A_k \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^t M_n(T_k)$ for some $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite commutative local ring T_k with principal maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_k$ which is generated by the same uniformizer π of D, so that $\mathfrak{m}_k = \pi T_k$.*

A ring T_k as described in Lemma 3.4 will be called a *chain ring*, as in [14]. Note that T_1 is equal to a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, which contains the residue field of D at P.

In Lemma 3.4, it is clear that n and t do not depend on k, since the A_k's form an inverse system with respect to the natural projection maps $A_k \to A_k/\pi^{k-1}A_k \cong A_{k-1}$, and these maps are compatible with finite direct product and matrix rings. In particular, we have

$$T_k \to T_k/\pi^{k-1}T_k \cong T_{k-1}$$

so the T_k's also form an inverse system of chain rings. Moreover, since the nilpotency of π in A_k is k, it follows that the nilpotency of π in T_k is also k and the residue field of T_k is $T_1 = \mathbb{F}_q$.

Given that the P-adic completion $\widehat{A}_P$ is equal to the inverse limit $\varprojlim A_k$, it is natural to consider the inverse limit of the chain rings T_k. It is well known that the completion of any DVR V with

maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ is realized as the inverse limit of the chain rings $V/\mathfrak{m}^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The next lemma shows that, under certain mild assumptions, the converse is also true (it is probable that this lemma is a known result, but a proof was not found in the available literature, so one is provided for the sake of the reader).

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\{T_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an inverse system of chain rings with maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_k = \pi_k T_k$ such that k is the nilpotency of π_k, and the transition maps $\theta_k : T_k \to T_{k-1}$ are all surjective (so, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\pi_k \mapsto \pi_{k-1}$). We assume that T_1 is the common residue field of the rings T_k.*

Then the inverse limit $\widehat{T} = \varprojlim T_k$ is a complete DVR with residue field isomorphic to T_1.

Proof. We identify the inverse limit $\widehat{T}$ with the subset of coherent sequences of the direct product of the T_k's:

$$\widehat{T} = \varprojlim T_k = \{(a_k) \in \prod_{k\geq 1} T_k \mid a_{k+1} \mapsto a_k, \forall k \geq 1\}.$$

Let

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{m}} = \{(a_k) \in \widehat{T} \mid a_k \in \mathfrak{m}_k, \forall k \geq 1\}.$$

Note that, for $(a_k) \in \widehat{T}$, (a_k) is in $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$ if and only if for some k we have $a_k \in \mathfrak{m}_k$. Clearly, $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$ is an ideal of $\widehat{T}$. We claim that every element of $\widehat{T} \setminus \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$ is invertible, which shows that $\widehat{T}$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$. Indeed, let $(a_k) \in \widehat{T} \setminus \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a_k is invertible in T_k, and it is easy to see that (a_k^{-1}) is a coherent sequence and is the inverse of (a_k) in $\widehat{T}$.

Moreover, $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}} = \pi\widehat{T}$, where $\pi = (\pi_k) \in \widehat{T}$. In fact, by definition $\pi \in \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$. Conversely, if $(a_k) \in \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$, then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $a_k = \pi_k b_k$, for some $b_k \in T_k$. One may verify that (b_k) is a coherent sequence, so $(a_k) = \pi(b_k) \in \pi\widehat{T}$. Note also that π is not a nilpotent element of $\widehat{T}$, because if $e \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\pi^e = (\pi_k^e) = 0$, then we have $e \geq k$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction.

Now, we clearly have $\bigcap_{k\geq 1} \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}^k = (0)$, so by [3, Chap. VI, §1, n. 4, Prop. 2] $\widehat{T}$ is a DVR. It remains to show that $\widehat{T}$ is complete with respect to the $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$-adic topology.

Since each transition map $\theta_k : T_k \to T_{k-1}$ is surjective, each projection $\psi_k : \widehat{T} \to T_k$ is also surjective. Furthermore, the kernel of ψ_k is $\pi^k\widehat{T}$, since the maximal ideal of T_k has nilpotency k by assumption. So, we may identify each chain ring T_k with the residue ring $\widehat{T}/\pi^k\widehat{T} = \widehat{T}/\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}^k$. Hence, $\widehat{T} = \varprojlim \widehat{T}/\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}^k$, which shows that the topology on $\widehat{T}$ as the inverse limit of the chain rings $\{T_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ coincides with the $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$-adic topology and that $\widehat{T}$ is complete with respect to the $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$-adic topology [3, Chap. III, §2, n. 6]. □

The next theorem gives the promised characterization of Int_K-decomposable algebras in terms of the completions $\widehat{A}_P$. Given a prime ideal P of D, we denote by $\widehat{D}_P$ the P-adic completion of D, and denote by $\widehat{K}_P$ the P-adic completion of K (which is also the fraction field of $\widehat{D}_P$).

Theorem 3.6. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then, A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if, for each nonzero prime ideal $P \subset D$, there exist $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\widehat{A}_P \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\widehat{T}_P) \tag{3.7}$$

where $\widehat{T}_P$ is a complete DVR with finite residue field and quotient field which is a finite unramified extension of $\widehat{K}_P$.

In particular, if A is commutative then A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if, for each nonzero prime ideal $P \subset D$, $\widehat{A}_P \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \widehat{T}_P$, where $\widehat{T}_P$ is as above.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that D is a DVR with maximal ideal $P = \pi D$. We retain the notation introduced at the beginning of this section.

Suppose first that A is Int_K-decomposable. Then, the P-adic completion $\widehat{A}_P$ of A is equal to the inverse limit of the rings A_k [3, Chap. III, §2, n. 6]. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let T_k be as in Lemma 3.4, and let $\widehat{T}_P$ be their inverse limit, which is a complete DVR with maximal ideal $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}_P$ by Lemma 3.5. Since the formation of inverse limit commutes with finite direct sums, by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\widehat{A}_P = \varprojlim_{k\geq 1} A_k = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \varprojlim_{k\geq 1} M_n(T_k) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\widehat{T}_P). \tag{3.8}$$

Now, $D_k \subseteq A_k \cong \bigoplus_i M_n(T_k)$, so by [27, Lem. 5.1] each matrix ring $M_n(T_k)$ contains a (central) copy of D_k, which is contained in the set of scalar matrices T_k. Since the maximal ideals of D_k and T_k have the same generator π, $D_k \subseteq T_k$ is an unramified extension of chain rings [14, p. 281]. So, by Lemma 3.5, $\widehat{D}_P = \varprojlim D_k \subseteq \widehat{T}_P = \varprojlim T_k$ is an unramified extension of complete DVRs since π generates the maximal ideals of both $\widehat{D}_P$ and $\widehat{T}_P$. Let $\widehat{F}_P$ be the quotient field of $\widehat{T}_P$, let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the residue field of $\widehat{T}_P$, and let $\mathbb{F}_{q_0}$ be the residue field of $\widehat{D}_P$. Then, $\widehat{F}_P/\widehat{K}_P$ is an unramified field extension of finite degree $[\widehat{F}_P : \widehat{K}_P] = [\mathbb{F}_q : \mathbb{F}_{q_0}]$. This establishes that if A is Int_K-decomposable, then we have the desired decomposition (3.7) for $\widehat{A}_P$.

Conversely, suppose (3.7) holds, where $\widehat{T}_P$ is a complete DVR which is a finite unramified extension of $\widehat{D}_P$. In particular, $\widehat{P} \cdot \widehat{T}_P = \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$, the maximal ideal of $\widehat{T}_P$. As above, let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the (finite) residue field of $\widehat{T}_P$. Then,

$$\widehat{A}/\widehat{P}\widehat{A} \cong A/PA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$$

so by Theorem 2.9 A is Int_K-decomposable. □

Theorem 3.6 is the analog of Theorem 2.9. One of the necessary conditions in Theorem 3.6 is that $\widehat{T}_P$ be unramified over $\widehat{D}_P$. We point out that this lack of ramification is reflected in Theorem 2.9 by the fact that A/PA must be a semisimple D/P-algebra in order for A to be Int_K-decomposable. There is also an analogous form of Theorem 2.10, the proof of which requires the next lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *Let D be a DVR with maximal ideal $P = \pi D$. Let A be a D-algebra with standard assumptions, and let $\widehat{A}$ be the P-adic completion of A. Then, $\mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A}) = \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$.*

Proof. The containment $\mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A}) \subseteq \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ is clear, since A embeds in $\widehat{A}$. Conversely, let $f \in \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$ and $\alpha \in \widehat{A}$. Suppose $f(X) = g(X)/\pi^k$, where $g \in D[X]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 0$, then $f \in D[X] \subseteq \mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A})$, so assume that $k > 1$.

Via the canonical projection $\widehat{A} \to A/\pi^k A$, we see that there exists $a \in A$ such that $\alpha \equiv a \pmod{\pi^k \widehat{A}}$. Since the coefficients of g are central in A, we get $g(\alpha) \equiv g(a) \pmod{\pi^k \widehat{A}}$. Thus, $f(\alpha) = f(a) + \lambda/\pi^k$, where $\lambda \in \pi^k \widehat{A}$, so that $f(\alpha) \in \widehat{A}$. Hence, $f \in \mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A})$ and $\mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A}) = \mathrm{Int}_K(A)$. □

Theorem 3.10. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings. Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Then, $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ if and only if, for each nonzero prime ideal P of D, $\widehat{A}_P \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \widehat{D}_P$, for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Note that if t is the rank of A, defined as the dimension of $B = K \otimes_D A$ over K, then, for each prime ideal P of D, the rank of $A_P = D_P \otimes_D A \subset B$ is equal to t, so that t does not depend on the particular prime ideal P. As we have already remarked, A_P is free as a D_P-module, so that $A_P \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} D_P$ (as D_P-modules).

We may work locally since $\widehat{A}_P = (\widehat{A_P})_{PD_P}$. So, we will assume that D is a DVR and we will omit the suffix P.

If $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$ then A is Int_K-decomposable, by Proposition 2.7. Hence, by Theorem 2.10, we have $A/PA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} D/P$. By Theorem 3.6, the completion $\widehat{A}$ decomposes as a finite direct sum of matrix rings over a complete DVR $\widehat{T}$, which is a finite unramified extension of $\widehat{D}$ (so that $\widehat{P} \cdot \widehat{T}$ is equal to the maximal ideal $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$ of $\widehat{T}$). Since $\widehat{A}/\widehat{P}\widehat{A} \cong A/PA$, formula (3.7) becomes $\widehat{A} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \widehat{D}$, that is, $n = 1$ and $\widehat{D} = \widehat{T}$, because the residue field $\widehat{T}/\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}$ of $\widehat{T}$ must be isomorphic to D/P, the residue field of $\widehat{D}$.

Conversely, if $\widehat{A}$ is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of copies of $\widehat{D}$, then by Lemma 3.9 we have

$$\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A}) = \mathrm{Int}_K(\bigoplus_i \widehat{D}) = \mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{D}) = \mathrm{Int}(D)$$

as desired. □

At this point, it is apparent that Int-decomposable algebras are related to matrix algebras via their residue rings and completions. At the close of this paper, we will prove (Corollary 4.12) that when $D = \mathbb{Z}$, A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable if and only if there exist $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\mathbb{Z})$ (which implies that if A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable, then $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A) = \mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(M_n(\mathbb{Z}))$ for some n). However, in general the two types of algebras are not equivalent. We end this section with a theorem that considers some of the conditions that link matrix algebras with Int-decomposable algebras, and examines the implications among these conditions.

Theorem 3.11. *Let D be a Dedekind domain with finite residue rings and A a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. Consider the following four conditions:*

(i) there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A \cong M_n(D)$.

(ii) there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\widehat{A}_P \cong M_n(\widehat{D}_P)$, for all primes P of D.

(iii) A is Int_K-decomposable.

(iv) there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))$.

Then, the following implications hold: $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$, $(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$, and $(ii) \Rightarrow (iv)$; but for none of these three implications does the converse hold. Finally, $(iii) \not\Rightarrow (iv)$ and $(iv) \not\Rightarrow (iii)$.

Proof. The implication $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ is clear, and $(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$ is Theorem 2.9.

$((ii) \Rightarrow (iv))$ Clearly, it is sufficient to prove the statement locally at each maximal ideal P of D. Thus, we suppose that D is a DVR. By Lemma 3.9 we have $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}_K(\widehat{A})$ and

$\mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D)) = \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(\widehat{D}))$, and since $\widehat{A} \cong M_n(\widehat{D})$ the statement holds.

We now show by counterexamples that the other stated implications do not hold.

($(ii) \not\Rightarrow (i)$) Let p be an odd prime of $\mathbb{Z}$, let $D = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, and let A be the standard quaternion algebra $A = D \oplus D\mathbf{i} \oplus D\mathbf{j} \oplus D\mathbf{k}$ (so that $\mathbf{i}^2 = \mathbf{j}^2 = -1$ and $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{ji}$). Then, it is well known (cf. [11, Exer. 3A]) that $A/p^kA \cong M_2(D/p^kD) \cong M_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})$ for all $k > 0$, so that $\widehat{A} \cong M_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. However, $A \ncong M_2(D)$, because (among other reasons) A contains no nonzero nilpotent elements.

($(iii) \not\Rightarrow (ii)$) Take $A = M_n(D) \oplus M_n(D)$. Then, A is Int_K-decomposable by Theorem 2.9, but $A/PA \cong M_n(D/P) \oplus M_n(D/P)$, so (ii) does not hold.

($(iv) \not\Rightarrow (ii)$) Again take $A = M_n(D) \oplus M_n(D)$. Then, (ii) does not hold, but $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))$ by [27, Thm. 2.3].

($(iii) \not\Rightarrow (iv)$) Let $K \subsetneq L$ be an unramified Galois extension of number fields. Let $D = O_K$ and take $A = O_L$. Then—as we will show in Corollary 4.11—A is Int_K-decomposable. However, we argue that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L) \neq \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))$. First, if $n = 1$, then $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L) = \mathrm{Int}_K(D) = \mathrm{Int}(O_K)$; but, by Corollary 4.11, this is impossible because $L \neq K$. So, assume that $n > 1$. Then, by [20, Prop. 7] $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L)$ is integrally closed (this also follows from [13, Thm. 3.7]). But, $\mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))$ is never integrally closed when $n > 1$ [21, Cor. 3.4], so $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L) \neq \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))$ for $n > 1$.

($(iv) \not\Rightarrow (iii)$) Let $n > m \geq 1$ and take $A = M_n(D) \oplus M_m(D)$. Then, $\mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D)) \subseteq \mathrm{Int}_K(M_m(D))$, so $\mathrm{Int}_K(A) = \mathrm{Int}_K(M_n(D))$ by [27, Thm. 2.3]. But, for any prime P of D, we have $A/PA \cong M_n(D/P) \oplus M_m(D/P)$, which does not satisfy Theorem 2.9. □

4 Extended Algebras and Maximal Orders

In this final section, we examine the consequences Theorems 2.9 and 3.6, which allows us to consider Int-decomposable algebras without regard to integer-valued polynomials. The characterizations given in Theorems 2.9 and 3.6 show that an Int-decomposable algebra can be described—either residually or in terms of its completions—in terms of matrix rings. In the case where D is the ring of integers of a number field K, we are able to completely classify Int_K-decomposable algebras A as those which are the maximal orders of the extended K-algebra B; B is a separable K-algebra whose simple components share a common center F; F is a finite unramified Galois extension of K; and each simple component of B is unramified at each finite place of F.

The work in this section relies heavily on the theory of maximal orders, as presented in [25]. We begin by recalling several definitions from [25] and [26]. As in earlier sections, D denotes a Dedekind domain with fraction field K.

Definitions 4.1. Let B be a finite dimensional K-algebra.

- By the Wedderburn Structure Theorem [24, Thm. 3.5], if B is semisimple, then we have $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_{n_i}(\mathcal{D}_i)$, for some uniquely determined $r, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and division rings $\mathcal{D}_i$; the $B_i = M_{n_i}(\mathcal{D}_i)$ are the *simple components* of B. We denote by $Z(\mathcal{D}_i)$ the center of $\mathcal{D}_i$,

which is a finite field extension of K. We say that B is *separable* if B is a finite dimensional semisimple K-algebra, such that the center of each simple component of B is a separable field extension of K [25, p. 99].

- A *D-order* in B is a subring A of B such that A is a finitely generated D-submodule of B and $K \cdot A = B$. A *maximal D-order* in B is a D-order that is not properly contained in any other D-order of B (see [25, p. 108, 110]). Note that in the setting of this paper, a D-algebra A of finite type is a D-order in the extended K-algebra $B = K \otimes_D A$ (and vice versa, a D-order A in a K-algebra B is a D-algebra of finite type).

- We say that a field extension F/K is a *splitting field* of the K-algebra B if the extended F-algebra $B \otimes_K F$ is a direct sum of full matrix algebras over F, that is, $B \otimes_K F \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s} M_{n_i}(F)$ [26, Def. 18.30]. It is easy to see that if a finite dimensional K-algebra B admits a splitting field F, then B is semisimple, since the extended F-algebra $B \otimes_K F$ is semisimple (cf. [26, p. 151]).

- If $B = M_n(\mathcal{D})$ is a K-central simple algebra, where $\mathcal{D}$ is a division algebra, we denote by $\deg(B) = \sqrt{[B : K]}$ the *degree* of B. If D is a Dedekind domain and $P \subset D$ a maximal ideal, then $\widehat{K}_P$ is a splitting field of B if and only if B is *unramified* at P in the sense of [25, Chap. 8, §32], that is, $\widehat{B}_P = B \otimes_K \widehat{K}_P \cong M_{nd}(\widehat{K}_P)$, where d is the degree of $\mathcal{D}$.

When D is the ring of integers of a number field, we will demonstrate that Int_K-decomposable algebras can be completely classified in terms of these definitions. We first consider the local case where D is a DVR, and then globalize this to the general case.

4.1 Local case

In this subsection, D is a DVR with maximal ideal P and finite residue field. As in Section 3, we denote by $\widehat{D}$ and $\widehat{A}$ the P-adic completions of D and A (and in general all completions are with respect to the P-adic topology).

Theorem 4.2. *Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions and let $B = A \otimes_D K$ be the extended K-algebra. Then A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if A is a maximal order in B, B is a separable K-algebra with simple components $B_1, \ldots, B_r$ and there exists a finite unramified extension $\widehat{F}$ of $\widehat{K}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which satisfy these conditions for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$:*

(i) $F_i \otimes_K \widehat{K} \cong \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} \widehat{F}$ *for some* $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) $B_i \otimes_{F_i} \widehat{F} = M_n(\widehat{F})$.

Note that, by [15, Chap. 6, Prop. 6.1] the above condition (i) is equivalent to the following: for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, all the prime ideals in the integral closure D_{F_i} of D in F_i (which necessarily lie above P) are unramified and have the same residue field degree, equal to $[\widehat{F} : \widehat{K}]$ (which is independent of i). In particular, $\widehat{F}$ is the completion of F_i at each prime ideal of D_{F_i}. The second condition says that $\widehat{F}$ is a splitting field of each simple component B_i, that is, B_i is unramified at each finite place of its center F_i and the degree of each simple component B_i as a F_i-central simple algebra is constant, independent of i. So we can say that P is unramified in each B_i.

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) Assume the above conditions on A, B are satisfied. Since B is semisimple, we have

$$B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_{n_i}(\mathcal{D}_i) \tag{4.3}$$

for some $r, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and division rings $\mathcal{D}_i$. We denote by B_i the simple component $M_{n_i}(\mathcal{D}_i)$ of B and by F_i the center of $\mathcal{D}_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

Note that for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$ by condition (i) we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_i \otimes_K \widehat{K} = (B_i \otimes_{F_i} F_i) \otimes_K \widehat{K} = B_i \otimes_{F_i} (F_i \otimes_K \widehat{K}) \\ = B_i \otimes_{F_i} (\prod_{j=1}^{k_i} \widehat{F}) = \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} (B_i \otimes_{F_i} \widehat{F}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

so by condition (ii) we conclude that $B_i \otimes_K \widehat{K} = \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} M_n(\widehat{F})$. Hence, the P-adic completion of B is:

$$\widehat{B} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} (B_i \otimes_K \widehat{K}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k_i} M_n(\widehat{F}) = \bigoplus_{h=1}^{t} M_n(\widehat{F}). \tag{4.5}$$

Finally, since B is a separable K-algebra and A is a maximal D-order in B, it follows by [25, Thm. 11.5] that $\widehat{A}$ is a maximal $\widehat{D}$-order in $\widehat{B}$. Moreover, by [25, Thm. 10.5], A decomposes as $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} A_i$, where A_i is a maximal D-order in B_i, for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Similarly, $\widehat{A}$ decomposes as $\widehat{A} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \widehat{A}_i$, where each $\widehat{A}_i$ is a maximal $\widehat{D}$-order in the simple component $M_n(\widehat{F})$ of $\widehat{B}$. By [25, Thm. 17.3], each $\widehat{A}_i$ is conjugated by a unit of $M_n(\widehat{F})$ to the maximal $\widehat{D}$-order $M_n(\widehat{T})$, where $\widehat{T}$ is the DVR of the local field $\widehat{F}$. In particular, each maximal $\widehat{D}$-order $\widehat{A}_i$ is isomorphic to $M_n(\widehat{T})$, so by Theorem 3.6 A is Int_K-decomposable.

($\Rightarrow$) Assume that A is Int_K-decomposable. By Theorem 3.6 we have that $\widehat{A} = A \otimes_D \widehat{D} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M_n(\widehat{T})$ for some $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite unramified extension $\widehat{T}$ of $\widehat{D}$. Then,

$$\widehat{B} = B \otimes_K \widehat{K} = (A \otimes_D K) \otimes_D \widehat{D} = \widehat{A} \otimes_D K \cong \bigoplus_{h=1}^{t} M_n(\widehat{F}) \tag{4.6}$$

(note that $\widehat{T} \otimes_D K = \widehat{F}$). Therefore, $\widehat{B}$ is a $\widehat{K}$-semisimple algebra with center equal to $Z(\widehat{B}) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \widehat{F}$. Since an unramified extension of a local field is separable [15, Thm 5.26], $\widehat{B}$ is a separable $\widehat{K}$-algebra. Moreover, each component $M_n(\widehat{T})$ of $\widehat{A}$ is a maximal $\widehat{D}$-order in the respective simple component $\widehat{B}_i = M_n(\widehat{F})$ of $\widehat{B}$ (see [25, Thm. 8.7]), so, by [25, Thm. 10.5], $\widehat{A}$ is a maximal $\widehat{D}$-order in $\widehat{B}$. By [25, Thm. 11.5], A is a maximal D-order in B.

Now, by [24, Prop. 10.6b] B is K-separable, hence semisimple. Therefore, B decomposes as a finite direct sum of matrix algebras $B_i = M_{n_i}(\mathcal{D}_i)$ as in (4.3) for some $r, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and division rings $\mathcal{D}_i$ whose centers $F_i = Z(\mathcal{D}_i)$ are finite separable field extensions of K.

By [15, Prop. 6.1], for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $F_i \otimes_K \widehat{K} = \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} \widehat{F}_{ij}$, where $\widehat{F}_{ij}$ is a finite separable extension of $\widehat{K}$ for all i, j (the $\widehat{F}_{ij}$ are the completions of F_i at the different prime ideals of D_{F_i} which lie above P). Moreover, $B_i \otimes_{F_i} \widehat{F}_{ij}$ is a central simple algebra over $\widehat{F}_{ij}$, say equal to $M_{m_{ij}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{ij})$,

where $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{ij}$ is a central division algebra over $\widehat{F}_{ij}$ [25, Cor. 7.8]. As in (4.4) we get

$$\widehat{B} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r}(B_i \otimes_K \widehat{K}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r}\bigoplus_{j=1}^{k_i}(B_i \otimes_{F_i} \widehat{F}_{ij}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r}\bigoplus_{j=1}^{k_i} M_{m_{ij}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{ij}). \tag{4.7}$$

By comparing (4.6) and (4.7) and applying the Wedderburn Structure Theorem, we deduce that $m_{ij} = n$, $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{ij} = \widehat{F}$ for all i and j, and $\sum_{i=1}^{r} k_i = t$. This forces $\widehat{F}_{ij} = \widehat{F}$ for all i and j, so that condition (i) is satisfied. Also, $B_i \otimes_{F_i} \widehat{F}_{ij} = B_i \otimes_{F_i} \widehat{F} = M_n(\widehat{F})$, so that condition (ii) is satisfied, too. □

Remark 4.8. Assume A is Int_K-decomposable, so B decomposes as in (4.3). For each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, let D_{F_i} be the integral closure of D in the center F_i of the simple component B_i of B and consider it as a (commutative) D-algebra. Then the theorem shows (via condition (ii)) that the D_{F_i} are Int_K-decomposable (according to Theorem 2.9). It also shows that each component A_i of A is Int_K-decomposable and also Int_{F_i}-decomposable as well.

Note that while the degree of the B_i's as F_i-central simple algebras is the same for all i, it is not necessarily true that the dimension of the B_i's over K is the same for all i. The point is that the centers F_i's may be different from each other (and, in particular, have different degree over K). For example, let $D = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ where p is an odd prime, let A_1 be the standard quaternion algebra $A_1 = D \oplus D\mathbf{i} \oplus D\mathbf{j} \oplus D\mathbf{k}$ (so that $\mathbf{i}^2 = \mathbf{j}^2 = -1$ and $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{ji}$). Then, $B_1 = \mathbb{Q} \oplus \mathbb{Q}\mathbf{i} \oplus \mathbb{Q}\mathbf{j} \oplus \mathbb{Q}\mathbf{k}$, so $n_1 = 1$ and $m_1 = 2$. Let $F/\mathbb{Q}$ be a quadratic field extension in which p splits completely and let $D_{F,p}$ be the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ in F (so $D_{F,p}/pD_{F,p} \cong \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$). Let $A_2 = M_2(O_{F,p})$, so $B_2 = M_2(F)$, $n_2 = 2$, and $m_2 = 1$. Then $A = A_1 \oplus A_2$ is Int_K-decomposable. Note that $n_1 m_1 = n_2 m_2 = 2$ and B_1 and B_2 have different dimension over $\mathbb{Q}$: $[B_1 : \mathbb{Q}] = 4$ but $[B_2 : \mathbb{Q}] = 8$.

In the global case where D is the ring of integers of a number field, which will be treated in the next subsection, we will see that if condition (ii) of Theorem 4.2 holds at each maximal ideal of D, then the simple components of the separable K-algebra B have all the same center F, which is an unramified Galois extension of K.

Remark 4.9. Let A be an Int_K-decomposable algebra, as in the statement of Theorem 4.2. Since the finite unramified extension $\widehat{F}$ of $\widehat{K}$ of condition (ii) of the statement is a Galois extension, from (4.5) it is easy to see that $\widehat{F}$ is a splitting field of the K-algebra B. However, in general the converse does not hold, that is, a finite unramified extension $\widehat{F}$ of $\widehat{K}$ can be a splitting field of B without A being Int_K-decomposable. For example, let F be a finite field extension of K such that the maximal ideal P of D is unramified in D_F and the prime ideals above P have different residue field degree. Then, by Theorem 2.9 the D-algebra $A = D_F$ is not Int_K-decomposable. Let $\widehat{F}$ be a finite unramified extension of $\widehat{K}$ containing all the completions of A at the different prime ideals above P. Then $F \otimes_K \widehat{F} = (F \otimes_K \widehat{K}) \otimes_{\widehat{K}} \widehat{F} = \prod_j \widehat{F}_j \otimes_{\widehat{K}} \widehat{F} = \prod_j \widehat{F}$ (notice that $\widehat{F}_j \otimes_{\widehat{K}} \widehat{F}$ is equal to a direct product of copies of $\widehat{F}$), so $\widehat{F}$ is a splitting field of $B = F$.

4.2 Global case

We now establish a global variant of Theorem 4.2. In this final subsection, we assume that D is the ring of integers of a number field K. This enables us to use some of the powerful tools of algebraic number theory, such as the Tchebotarev Density Theorem and the Hasse-Brauer-Noether-Albert Theorem. As usual, A is a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions.

Theorem 4.10. *Let K be a number field with ring of integers D. Let A be a D-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions and let $B = A \otimes_D K$ be the extended K-algebra. Then, A is Int_K-decomposable if and only if A is a maximal order in B and B is a separable K-algebra with simple components $B_1, \ldots, B_r$ such that the following hold:*

(i) the B_i share a common center F.

(ii) F is a finite unramified Galois field extension of K.

(iii) for each i, B_i is unramified at each finite place of F.

(iv) the degree of B_i as an F-central simple algebra is the same for each i.

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) Assume the above conditions on A and B are satisfied. Let P be a fixed maximal ideal of D. Then, by conditions (ii) and (iii) and [15, Prop. 6.1] we have $F \otimes_K \widehat{K} = \prod_{j=1}^{k} \widehat{F}_P$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\widehat{F}_P$ is a finite unramified extension of $\widehat{K}_P$; note that $\widehat{F}_P$ is the completion of F at any prime ideal which lies above P. Therefore, by (4.4) and conditions (i) and (iv) we have

$$\widehat{B}_P = B \otimes_K \widehat{K}_P = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} (B_i \otimes_K \widehat{K}_P) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} (B_i \otimes_F \widehat{F}_P) = \bigoplus_{h=1}^{t} M_n(\widehat{F}_P)$$

Since A is a maximal D-order in B, by [25, Cor. 11.2 & Thm. 11.5] $\widehat{A}_P$ is a maximal $\widehat{D}_P$-order in $\widehat{B}_P$, so by [25, Thm. 10.5] $\widehat{A}_P$ decomposes as $\widehat{A}_P = \bigoplus_{h=1}^{t} \widehat{A}_h$, where each $\widehat{A}_h$ is a maximal $\widehat{D}_P$-order in $M_n(\widehat{F}_P)$. If $\widehat{T}_P$ is the valuation ring of $\widehat{F}_P$, then by [25, Thm. 17.3] $\widehat{A}_h$ is a conjugate of (hence isomorphic to) $M_n(\widehat{T}_P)$, for each $h = 1, \ldots, t$. Since P was an arbitrary maximal ideal of D, by Theorem 3.6 it follows that A is Int_K-decomposable.

($\Rightarrow$) Assume now that A is Int_K-decomposable. Since Int_K-decomposability is a local property (Proposition 2.8), for each maximal ideal P of D, $A_P = A \otimes_D D_P$ is Int_K-decomposable, so we may apply Theorem 4.2 to A_P. Thus, A_P is a maximal D_P-order in B, and B is a separable K-algebra and decomposes as $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} B_i$ with simple components B_i with centers F_i which are finite separable field extensions of K, for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Moreover, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[B_i : F_i] = n^2$, for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, and hence (iv) holds. Note that r is independent of the particular maximal ideal P of D. Moreover, since A is locally a maximal D_P-order in B, A is a maximal D-order in B ([25, Cor. 11.2]).

For each prime ideal P of D, by condition (i) of Theorem 4.2 there exists a finite unramified extension $\widehat{F}_P$ of $\widehat{K}_P$ such that, for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $\widehat{F}_P$ is the completion of F_i at any prime ideal Q of the ring of integers D_{F_i} which lies over P. Furthermore, by condition (ii) of Theorem 4.2 $\widehat{F}_P$ is a splitting field of the F_i-central simple algebra B_i. These facts imply that all the field extensions $F_1, \ldots, F_r$ are unramified over K and by the Tchebotarev Density Theorem they also are Galois extensions (see [16, Cor. VII.13.8]). Moreover, since a finite Galois extension F of K is completely determined by the set of prime ideals of K which split completely in F (again by the same theorem of Tchebotarev, see [16, Cor. VII.13.10]), it follows that $F_1, \ldots, F_r$ are all equal to the same finite unramified Galois extension F. All of this proves conditions (i), (ii), and (iii). □

We close this paper with two corollaries. In the first one we specialize Theorems 2.9 and 2.10 to the case where D and A are rings of integers in number fields, which results in a very clean description of Int_K-decomposable algebras. In the second corollary, we show that over $\mathbb{Q}$, an $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable algebra A has a particularly nice form: it is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of copies

of $M_n(\mathbb{Z})$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This corollary also demonstrates that—with our usual assumptions in place—a matrix algebra over $\mathbb{Z}$ can be recognized by its residues and completions.

Corollary 4.11. *Let $K \subseteq L$ be number fields with rings of integers O_K and O_L, respectively. Consider O_L as an O_K-algebra. Then*

(1) O_L is Int_K-decomposable if and only if L/K is an unramified Galois extension.

(2) $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L) = \mathrm{Int}(O_K)$ if and only if $L = K$.

Proof. (1) This follows from Theorem 4.10.

(2) Clearly, $L = K$ implies that $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L) = \mathrm{Int}(O_K)$. So, assume that $\mathrm{Int}_K(O_L) = \mathrm{Int}(O_K)$. By Theorem 2.10, $O_L/PO_L \cong \bigoplus_i O_K/P$ for each nonzero prime P of O_K. From this, we see that O_L is Int_K-decomposable as an O_K-algebra, and moreover that $f(Q|P) = 1$ for each P and each Q above P (note that the same conclusion can be obtained from Theorem 3.10). By (1), L is an unramified Galois extension of K with all inertial degrees equal to 1, and so $L = K$ by [16, Thm. VI.3.8]. □

Corollary 4.12. *Let A be a $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra of finite type with standard assumptions. The following are equivalent.*

(1) A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable

(2) There exist $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_n(\mathbb{Z})$

(3) For all primes p, there exist $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A/pA \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_n(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$

(4) For all primes p, there exist $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\widehat{A}_p \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$

In particular, if A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable, then $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A) = \mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(M_n(\mathbb{Z}))$ for some n; and if $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A) = \mathrm{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$, then $A \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2). The other equivalences follow by Theorems 2.9 and 3.6.

By Theorem 4.10, if A is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of copies of $M_n(\mathbb{Z})$, then A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable (the same conclusion follows by the application of either Theorem 2.9 or Theorem 3.6). Conversely, if A is $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}$-decomposable then by the same theorem A is a maximal $\mathbb{Z}$-order in B and B is a separable $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra, say $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} B_i$, where the B_i's are the simple components of B. Since there is no proper unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}$, the center of each B_i is equal to $\mathbb{Q}$, by condition (ii) of Theorem 4.10.

Now, for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, by the Hasse-Brauer-Noether-Albert Theorem [25, Thm. 32.11] either $B_i \cong M_n(\mathbb{Q})$ or there are at least two primes of $\mathbb{Q}$ (finite or infinite) which ramify in B_i (see [25, Chap 8, §32.1, Exer. 1]). The latter situation cannot occur, because B_i is unramified at each finite place of its center $\mathbb{Q}$ by condition (iii) of Theorem 4.10. Since this holds for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, we must have $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_n(\mathbb{Q})$ (the fact that n is the same for each simple component of B is a consequence of condition (iv) of Theorem 4.10). Finally, since $\mathbb{Z}$ is a PID, each maximal $\mathbb{Z}$-order of $M_n(\mathbb{Q})$ is conjugate (hence isomorphic) to $M_n(\mathbb{Z})$, so $A \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} M_n(\mathbb{Z})$, as desired. The implication that $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A) = \mathrm{Int}_{\mathbb{Q}}(M_n(\mathbb{Z}))$ is clear, and the last claim follows from Proposition 2.7 and Theorem 2.10. □

The following example shows that the conclusion of Corollary 4.12 may fail if we work over a number field which is a proper extension of $\mathbb{Q}$.

Example 4.13. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. Consider the standard quaternion algebra B over K, which is $B = K \oplus K\mathbf{i} \oplus K\mathbf{j} \oplus K\mathbf{k}$, where $\mathbf{i}^2 = \mathbf{j}^2 = -1$ and $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{ji}$. This algebra is unramified at each finite prime of the ring of integers D of K but is ramified at the two infinite real primes. Hence, any maximal D-order A in B is Int_K-decomposable, by Theorem 4.10, but A cannot be isomorphic to a direct sum of matrix rings because B is a division ring.

Acknowledgments This work has been supported by the grant "Assegni Senior" of the University of Padova. The authors wish to thank Daniel Smertnig for pointing out the results which led to Corollary 4.12.

References

[1] M. F. Atiyah, I. G. MacDonald. *Introduction to commutative algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

[2] N. Bourbaki. *Algebra I Chapters 1 – 3*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[3] N. Bourbaki. *Commutative Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[4] J.-P. Cahen, J.-L. Chabert. *Integer-valued Polynomials*. Amer. Math. Soc. Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 48, Providence, 1997.

[5] J.-L. Chabert, G. Peruginelli. *Polynomial overrings of* Int($\mathbb{Z}$). J. Commut. Algebra 8 (2016), no. 1, 1–28.

[6] S. Evrard, Y. Fares, K. Johnson. *Integer valued polynomials on lower triangular matrices*. Monatsh. Math. 170 (2013), no. 2, 147–160.

[7] S. Evrard, K. Johnson. *The ring of integer valued polynomials on* 2×2 *matrices and its integral closure*. J. Algebra 441 (2015), 660–677.

[8] S. Frisch. *Integer-valued polynomials on algebras*. J. Algebra 373 (2013), 414–425.

[9] S. Frisch. *Corrigendum to "Integer-valued polynomials on algebras" [J. Algebra 373 (2013) 414–425]*. J. Algebra 412 (2014), 282.

[10] S. Frisch. *Integer-valued polynomials on algebras: a survey*. Actes du CIRM 2 (2) (2010), 27–32.

[11] K. Goodearl, R. Warfield Jr. *An introduction to noncommutative noetherian rings*. Lond. Math. Soc. Stud. Texts, vol. 16, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[12] T. Y. Lam. *Lectures on Modules and Rings*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 189. Springer, New York, 1999.

[13] K. A. Loper, N. J. Werner. *Generalized rings of integer-valued polynomials*. J. Number Theory 132 (2012), no. 11, 2481–2490.

[14] B. R. McDonald. *Finite Rings with Identity*. Pure Appl. Math., vol. 28, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1974.

[15] W. Narkiewicz. *Elementary and analytic theory of algebraic numbers*. Third edition. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[16] J. Neukirch. *Algebraic number theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[17] G. Peruginelli. *Integral-valued polynomials over sets of algebraic integers of bounded degree*. J. Number Theory 137 (2014), 241–255.

[18] G. Peruginelli. *Integer-valued polynomials over matrices and divided differences*. Monatsh. Math. 173 (2014), no. 4, 559–571.

[19] G. Peruginelli. *The ring of polynomials integral-valued over a finite set of integral elements*. J. Commut. Algebra 8 (2016), no. 1, 113–141.

[20] G. Peruginelli, N. J. Werner. *Integral closure of rings of integer-valued polynomials on algebras*. Commutative Algebra, 293–305, Springer, New York, 2014.

[21] G. Peruginelli, N. J. Werner. *Properly integral polynomials over the ring of integer-valued polynomials on a matrix ring*, J. Algebra 460 (2016) 320-339.

[22] G. Peruginelli, N. J. Werner. *Non-triviality Conditions for Integer-valued Polynomials on Algebras*, preprint, submitted.

[23] C. Polcino Milies, S. Sudarshan. *An introduction to group rings*. Algebras and Applications, 1. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.

[24] R. S. Pierce. *Associative algebras*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 88. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.

[25] I. Reiner. *Maximal orders*. Corrected reprint of the 1975 original. London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, 28. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.

[26] L. H. Rowen, *Graduate algebra: noncommutative view*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 91. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.

[27] N. J. Werner. *Int-decomposable algebras*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 218 (2014), no. 10, 1806–1819.

[28] N. J. Werner. *Integer-valued polynomials over matrix rings*. Comm. Algebra 40 (2012), no. 12, 4717–4726.

[29] N. J. Werner. *Integer-valued polynomials over quaternion rings*. J. Algebra 324 (2010), no. 7, 1754–1769.

[30] N. J. Werner. *Polynomials that kill each element of a finite ring*. J. Algebra Appl. 13 (2014), no. 3, 1350111, 12 pp.